



# UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE  
United States Patent and Trademark Office  
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS  
P.O. Box 1450  
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450  
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
-----------------	-------------	----------------------	---------------------	------------------

10/801,195

03/16/2004

Steve Armstrong

30203/39227

5133

4743 7590 08/10/2007  
MARSHALL, GERSTEIN & BORUN LLP  
233 S. WACKER DRIVE, SUITE 6300  
SEARS TOWER  
CHICAGO, IL 60606

EXAMINER

NORTON, JENNIFER L

ART UNIT

PAPER NUMBER

2121

MAIL DATE

DELIVERY MODE

08/10/2007

PAPER

**Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.**

The time period for reply, if any, is set in the attached communication.

## Office Action Summary

**Application No.**

10/801,195

**Applicant(s)**

ARMSTRONG ET AL.

**Examiner**

Jennifer L. Norton

**Art Unit**

2121

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

### Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) OR THIRTY (30) DAYS, WHICHEVER IS LONGER, FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

### Status

- 1) ☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on 25 June 2007.
- 2a) ☒ This action is FINAL. 2b) ☐ This action is non-final.
- 3) ☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

### Disposition of Claims

- 4) ☒ Claim(s) 1-44 is/are pending in the application.
- 4a) Of the above claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ is/are withdrawn from consideration.
- 5) ☐ Claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ is/are allowed.
- 6) ☒ Claim(s) 1-44 is/are rejected.
- 7) ☐ Claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ is/are objected to.
- 8) ☐ Claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

### Application Papers

- 9) ☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
- 10) ☒ The drawing(s) filed on 19 July 2004 and 27 October 2006 is/are: a) ☒ accepted or b) ☐ objected to by the Examiner.
- Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).
- Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).
- 11) ☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

### Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

- 12) ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
- a) ☐ All b) ☐ Some \* c) ☐ None of:
- ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
  - ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. \_\_\_\_\_.
  - ☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

\* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

### Attachment(s)

- |  |   |
|--|---|
| 1) <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)                                | 4) <input type="checkbox"/> Interview Summary (PTO-413)<br>Paper No(s)/Mail Date. _____ |
| 2) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)                       | 5) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of Informal Patent Application                       |
| 3) <input type="checkbox"/> Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO/SB/08)<br>Paper No(s)/Mail Date _____ | 6) <input type="checkbox"/> Other: _____  |

### **DETAILED ACTION**

1. The following is a **Final Office Action** in response to the Amendment received on 25 June 2007. Claims 1 and 24 been amended. Claims 1-44 are pending in this application.

### ***Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 102***

2. The following is a quotation of the appropriate paragraphs of 35 U.S.C. 102 that form the basis for the rejections under this section made in this Office action:

A person shall be entitled to a patent unless –

(e) the invention was described in (1) an application for patent, published under section 122(b), by another filed in the United States before the invention by the applicant for patent or (2) a patent granted on an application for patent by another filed in the United States before the invention by the applicant for patent, except that an international application filed under the treaty defined in section 351(a) shall have the effects for purposes of this subsection of an application filed in the United States only if the international application designated the United States and was published under Article 21(2) of such treaty in the English language.

3. Claims 1-4, 7-9, 15-18, 23-25, 27-30, 32-35 and 41-43 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(e) as being anticipated by U.S. Patent No. 6,889,096 (hereinafter Spriggs).

4. As per claim 1, Spriggs discloses a remote data viewing system for use in a process plant having a plurality of data source applications, each of which collects or generates entity data pertaining to one or more different entities within the process plant, the remote data viewing system comprising:

a primary data collection platform adapted to collect the entity data pertaining to the one or more different entities within the process plant from the data source applications (col. 8, lines 31-42),

wherein two or more of the plurality of data source applications each present the entity data in different formats (col. 11, lines 12-21 and 47-53, i.e. "the devices known supported protocol");

a database (Fig. 1, element 80) adapted to store the entity data pertaining to the one or more different entities (Fig. 1, element 60 and 70) within the process plant collected by the primary data collection platform (col. 8, lines 43-45);

a web server (i.e. Microsoft SQL Server) coupled to the primary data collection platform (col. 8, lines 45-47) and adapted to provide remote access to the entity data stored in the database (col. 8, lines 54-58) at one or more remote platforms (col. 3, lines 43-48, col. 9, lines 58-66 and col. 10, lines 10-18, col. 40, lines 5-8 and Fig. 2, element D sub. N); and

a display application (Fig. 2, element 100) stored on a computer readable memory and adapted to be executed on a processor within one of the one or more remote platforms to create a display for the entity data (col. 9, lines 55-66, col. 10, lines 10-18), the display including a navigational tree having a plurality of sections specifying different categories of entity data in the database and a display view (col. 8, lines 64-67, col. 9, lines 1-2 and Fig. 6 and 7, element 154), wherein the display application enables a user to select the different ones of the sections of the navigational

tree to specify different entity data to be displayed (col. 16, lines 52-59) and presents the entity data associated with a selected section of the navigational tree in a predetermined viewing format (col. 5, lines 41-59),

wherein the predetermined viewing format is a common display format for presenting entity data associated with each of the plurality of sections specifying the different entity data to be displayed (col. 15, lines 63-67).

5. As per claim 2, Spriggs discloses the predetermined viewing format organizes the entity data based on device tags (Fig. 6 and 7, element 112) associated with the entity data (col. 16, lines 52-55).

6. As per claim 3, Spriggs discloses the predetermined viewing format includes a display of audit trail data (col. 2, lines 52-59, col. 11, lines 47-57, col. 12, lines 20-22, col. 16, lines 52-55 and col. 33, lines 60-65) associated with the device tags (col. 33, lines 39-41).

7. As per claim 4, Spriggs discloses the predetermined viewing format includes a display of configuration data (col. 29, lines 18-30) associated with the device tags (col. 33, lines 39-41).

8. As per claim 7, Spriggs discloses the navigational tree includes a section specifying one or more plant locations (col. 8, lines 64-67 and col. 9, lines 1-2) associated with the entity data within the process plant (col. 5, lines 10-26).

9. As per claim 8, Spriggs discloses the navigational tree includes a section specifying one or more physical networks (col. 8, lines 64-67 and col. 9, lines 1-2) associated with the entity data within the process plant (col. 5, lines 10-26).

10. As per claim 9, Spriggs discloses the navigational tree includes a section specifying alerts (Fig. 13, element 262) associated with the entity data within the process plant (col. 26, lines 45-57).

11. As per claim 15, Spriggs discloses the navigational tree includes a section specifying user defined favorite data associated with the entity data within the process plant (col. 35, lines 7-10, col. 36, lines 47-63 and Fig. 16, element 208).

12. As per claim 16, Spriggs discloses the navigational tree includes a section specifying audit trail events (col. 2, lines 52-59, col. 11, lines 47-57, col. 12, lines 20-22, col. 16, lines 52-55 and col. 33, lines 60-65) associated with the entity data within the process plant (col. 26, lines 45-57).

Art Unit: 2121

13. As per claim 17, Spriggs discloses the navigational tree includes a section (Fig. 6 and 7, element 112) specifying device tags (col. 33, lines 39-41) associated with the entity data within the process plant (col. 16, lines 52-55 and col. 33, lines 37-39).

14. As per claim 18, Spriggs discloses an alert polling application which polls one or more devices within the process plant for alert information (col. 12, lines 26-30) and which sends the alert information to the remote platform for presentation via the predetermined viewing format (col. 12, lines 30-34).

15. As per claim 23, Spriggs discloses the navigational tree includes multiple sections, wherein each of the multiple sections specifies a different category of entity data (col. 8, lines 64-67, col. 9, lines 1-2 and Fig. 6 and 7, element 154) and wherein each of the multiple sections includes one or more associated predetermined viewing formats (col. 5, lines 41-59) used to view the entity data when selected by a user (col. 16, lines 52-59).

16. As per claim 24, Spriggs discloses a method of viewing entity data generated in a process plant having a plurality of data source applications, each of which collects or generates entity data pertaining to one or more different entities within the process plant, the method comprising:

collecting the entity data pertaining to the one or more entities within the process plant at a primary data collection platform (col. 8, lines 31-42) from the plurality of data source applications, wherein two or more of the plurality of data source applications each present the entity data in different formats (col. 11, lines 12-21 and 47-53, i.e. "the devices known supported protocol");

storing the collected entity data in a database associated with the primary data collection platform (col. 8, lines 43-45);

accessing the database from a remote site (Fig. 2, element D sub. N) geographically separated from the primary data collection platform (col. 3, lines 43-48, col. 8, lines 45-47, col. 9, lines 58-66 and col. 10, lines 10-18 and col. 40, lines 5-8) to obtain at least a portion of the entity data stored in the database (col. 8, lines 54-58);

displaying (Fig. 6 and 7, element 154) a navigational tree at the remote site (col. 9, lines 55-66, col. 10, lines 10-18), the navigational tree including a plurality of sections specifying categories of the entity data in the database (col. 8, lines 64-67, col. 9, lines 1-2); and

displaying a display view at the remote site in conjunction with the navigational tree (col. 16, lines 52-59), wherein the display view presents entity data in a predetermined viewing format in response to a selection of one of the sections of the navigational tree (col. 5, lines 41-59),



wherein the predetermined viewing format is a common display format for presenting entity data associated with each of the plurality of sections specifying different entity data to be display (col. 15, lines 63-67).

17. As per claim 25, Spriggs discloses accessing the database includes using a web server (col. 8, lines 54-58 and i.e. Microsoft SQL Server) located at a second site geographically separated from the remote site (Fig. 2, element D sub. N) to access the entity data stored in the database (col. 3, lines 43-48, col. 9, lines 58-66 and col. 10, lines 10-18, col. 40, lines 5-8).

18. As per claim 27, Spriggs discloses displaying the navigational tree includes displaying a first section of the navigational tree that organizes the entity data based on one or more plant locations within the process plant (col. 5, lines 10-26, col. 8, lines 64-67 and col. 9, lines 1-2).

19. As per claim 28, Spriggs discloses displaying the display view at the remote site includes presenting entity data (col. 16, lines 52-55) in a predetermined viewing format that organizes the entity data based on device tags (Fig. 6 and 7, element 112 and col. 33, lines 39-41) in response to a selection of a section of the navigational tree (col. 16, lines 55-59).

20. As per claim 29, Spriggs discloses the entity data includes audit trail data (col. 2, lines 52-59, col. 11, lines 47-57, col. 12, lines 20-22, col. 16, lines 52-55 and col. 33, lines 60-65) associated with the device tags (col. 33, lines 39-41).

21. As per claim 30, Spriggs discloses the entity data includes configuration data (col. 29, lines 18-30) associated with the device tags (col. 33, lines 39-41).

22. As per claim 32, Spriggs discloses displaying the navigational tree includes displaying a first section of the navigational tree that organizes the entity data based on one or more physical networks associated with the process plant (col. 5, lines 10-26, col. 8, lines 64-67 and col. 9, lines 1-2).

23. As per claim 33, Spriggs discloses displaying the navigational tree includes displaying a first section (col. 5, lines 10-26, col. 8, lines 64-67 and col. 9, lines 1-2) of the navigational tree that organizes the entity data based on alerts generated within the process plant (col. 12, lines 39-45, col. 17, lines 16-21 and Fig. 7, element 124).

24. As per claim 34, Spriggs discloses displaying the navigational tree includes displaying a section associated with active alerts and wherein displaying the display view includes presenting active alert entity data in a predetermined viewing format in

response to a selection of the section associated with the active alerts (col. 12, lines 39-45, col. 17, lines 16-25 and Fig. 7, element 124).

25. As per claim 35, Spriggs discloses displaying the navigational tree includes displaying a first section associated with polling for alerts generated within the process plant (col. 12, lines 26-30), further including initiating an alert polling application that polls for alerts within the process plant in response to a selection of the first section of the navigational tree (col. 13, lines 61-67 and 1-8) and wherein displaying the display view includes presenting alert data obtained by the alert polling application in a predetermined viewing format in response to the selection of the first section of the navigational tree (col. 13, lines 54-60).

26. As per claim 41, Spriggs discloses displaying the navigational tree includes displaying a first section of the navigational tree (col. 5, lines 10-26, col. 8, lines 64-67 and col. 9, lines 1-2) associated with audit trail entity data (col. 2, lines 52-59, col. 11, lines 47-57, col. 12, lines 20-22, col. 16, lines 52-55 and col. 33, lines 60-65).

27. As per claim 42, Spriggs discloses displaying the navigational tree includes displaying a first section (Fig. 6 and 7, element 112) of the navigational tree associated with entity data (col. 16, lines 52-55) organized by device tags (col. 33, lines 39-41).

Art Unit: 2121

28. As per claim 43, Spriggs discloses displaying the first section of the navigational tree includes one or more sub-sections associated with device tags organized by one or more of all devices and assigned devices (col. 5, lines 10-26, col. 8, lines 64-67 and col. 9, lines 1-2).

***Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103***

29. The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negated by the manner in which the invention was made.

30. Claims 5, 6, 10-14, 20, 21, 31, 36-40 and 44 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Spriggs in view of U.S. Patent Publication No. 2003/0149608 (hereinafter Kall).

31. As per claim 5, Spriggs teaches to the predetermined viewing format (Fig. 6 and 7, element 112) includes a display of data (col. 16, lines 52-55) associated with the device tags (col. 33, lines 39-41).

Spriggs does not expressly teach to calibration data.

Kall teaches to calibration data (pg. 9, par. [0165] and Fig. 32).

Therefore, it would have been obvious to a person of ordinary skill in the art at the time of applicant's invention to modify the teaching of Spriggs to include calibration data to synchronize and coordinate activities across multiple manufacturing sites (pg. 1, par. [0003]).

32. As per claim 6, Spriggs does not expressly teach the calibration data includes a result of at least one calibration procedure.

Kall teaches the calibration data includes a result of at least one calibration procedure (pg. 9, par. [0165] and Fig. 32).

Therefore, it would have been obvious to a person of ordinary skill in the art at the time of applicant's invention to modify the teaching of Spriggs to include calibration data that includes a result of at least one calibration procedure to synchronize and coordinate activities across multiple manufacturing sites (pg. 1, par. [0003]).

33. As per claim 10, Spriggs teaches the navigational tree includes a section specifying entities associated with the entity data within the process plant (col. 8, lines 64-67, col. 9, lines 1-2 and Fig. 6 and 7, element 154).

Spriggs does not expressly teach to calibration entities.

Kall teaches to calibration entities associated with the entity data within the process plant (pg. 9, par. [0165] and Fig. 32).

Therefore, it would have been obvious to a person of ordinary skill in the art at the time of applicant's invention to modify the teaching of Spriggs to include calibration entities associated with the entity data within the process plant to synchronize and coordinate activities across multiple manufacturing sites (pg. 1, par. [0003]).

34. As per claim 11, Spriggs does not expressly teach the calibration entities include at least one calibration route defined within the process plant.

Kall teaches to the calibration entities include at least one calibration route defined within the process plant (pg. 9, par. [0165] and Fig. 32).

Therefore, it would have been obvious to a person of ordinary skill in the art at the time of applicant's invention to modify the teaching of Spriggs to include at least one calibration route defined within the process plant to synchronize and coordinate activities across multiple manufacturing sites (pg. 1, par. [0003]).

35. As per claim 12, Spriggs does not expressly teach the calibration entities include calibration schedule information for at least one device within the process plant.

Kall teaches to calibration schedule information for at least one device within the process plant (pg. 9, par. [0165] and Fig. 32).

Therefore, it would have been obvious to a person of ordinary skill in the art at the time of applicant's invention to modify the teaching of Spriggs to include calibration schedule information for at least one device within the process plant to synchronize and coordinate activities across multiple manufacturing sites (pg. 1, par. [0003]).

36. As per claim 13, Spriggs does not expressly teach the predetermined viewing format includes a search engine that enables searching for calibration schedule data based on a priority of a calibration procedure.

Kall teaches to a search engine that enables searching for calibration schedule data based on a priority of a calibration procedure (pg. 9, par. [0165]-[0166], Fig. 32 and Fig. 33, i.e. automatic sort).

Therefore, it would have been obvious to a person of ordinary skill in the art at

the time of applicant's invention to modify the teaching of Spriggs to include a search engine that enables searching for calibration schedule data based on a priority of a calibration procedure to synchronize and coordinate activities across multiple manufacturing sites (pg. 1, par. [0003]).

37. As per claim 14, Spriggs does not expressly teach the predetermined viewing format includes a search engine enabling searching for calibration schedule data based on a time or date associated with a calibration procedure.

Kall teaches to a search engine enabling searching for calibration schedule data based on a time or date associated with a calibration procedure (pg. 9, par. [0165]-[0166], Fig. 32 and Fig. 33, i.e. automatic sort).

Therefore, it would have been obvious to a person of ordinary skill in the art at the time of applicant's invention to modify the teaching of Spriggs to include a search engine enabling searching for calibration schedule data based on a time or date associated with a calibration procedure to synchronize and coordinate activities across multiple manufacturing sites (pg. 1, par. [0003]).



38. As per claim 20, Spriggs does not expressly teach a search engine that searches entity data in the database and presents the entity data located in the search according to the predetermined viewing format.

Kall teaches to a search engine that searches entity data in the database and presents the entity data located in the search according to the predetermined viewing format (pg. 9, par. [0165]-[0166], Fig. 32 and Fig. 33, i.e. automatic sort).

Therefore, it would have been obvious to a person of ordinary skill in the art at the time of applicant's invention to modify the teaching of Spriggs to include a search engine that searches entity data in the database and presents the entity data located in the search according to the predetermined viewing format to synchronize and coordinate activities across multiple manufacturing sites (pg. 1, par. [0003]).

39. As per claim 21, Spriggs does not expressly teach the search engine includes a display field having search fields specifying parameters associated with the entity data.

Kall teaches to a search engine includes a display field having search fields specifying parameters associated with the entity data (pg. 9, par. [0165]-[0166], Fig. 32 and Fig. 33, i.e. automatic sort).

Therefore, it would have been obvious to a person of ordinary skill in the art at the time of applicant's invention to modify the teaching of Spriggs to include a search engine includes a display field having search fields specifying parameters associated with the entity data to synchronize and coordinate activities across multiple manufacturing sites (pg. 1, par. [0003]).

40. As per claim 31, Spriggs does not expressly teach the entity data includes calibration data associated with the device tags.

Kall teaches to calibration data (pg. 9, par. [0165] and Fig. 32).

Therefore, it would have been obvious to a person of ordinary skill in the art at the time of applicant's invention to modify the teaching of Spriggs to include calibration data to synchronize and coordinate activities across multiple manufacturing sites (pg. 1, par. [0003]).

41. As per claim 36, Spriggs teaches to displaying the navigational tree includes displaying a first section of the navigational tree that organizes the entity data based on events within the process plant (col. 8, lines 64-67, col. 9, lines 1-2 and Fig. 6 and 7, element 154).

Spriggs does not expressly teach to calibration events.

Kall teaches to calibration events (pg. 9, par. [0165] and Fig. 32).

Therefore, it would have been obvious to a person of ordinary skill in the art at the time of applicant's invention to modify the teaching of Spriggs to include calibration events to synchronize and coordinate activities across multiple manufacturing sites (pg. 1, par. [0003]).

42. As per claim 37, Spriggs does not expressly teach the calibration events include at least one calibration route defined within the process plant.

Kall teaches the calibration events include at least one calibration route defined within the process plant (pg. 9, par. [0165] and Fig. 32).

Therefore, it would have been obvious to a person of ordinary skill in the art at the time of applicant's invention to modify the teaching of Spriggs to include the calibration events include at least one calibration route defined within the process plant to synchronize and coordinate activities across multiple manufacturing sites (pg. 1, par. [0003]).

43. As per claim 38, Spriggs does not expressly teach the calibration events include at least one calibration schedule defined within the process plant.

Kall teaches the calibration events include at least one calibration schedule defined within the process plant (pg. 9, par. [0165] and Fig. 32).

Therefore, it would have been obvious to a person of ordinary skill in the art at the time of applicant's invention to modify the teaching of Spriggs to include the calibration events include at least one calibration schedule defined within the process plant to synchronize and coordinate activities across multiple manufacturing sites (pg. 1, par. [0003]).

44. As per claim 39, Spriggs does not expressly teach displaying the display view includes providing a search engine enabling searching for calibration schedule data based on a priority of a calibration procedure.

Kall teaches a search engine enabling searching for calibration schedule data based on a priority of a calibration procedure (pg. 9, par. [0165]-[0166], Fig. 32 and Fig. 33, i.e. automatic sort).

Therefore, it would have been obvious to a person of ordinary skill in the art at

the time of applicant's invention to modify the teaching of Spriggs to include a search engine enabling searching for calibration schedule data based on a priority of a calibration procedure to synchronize and coordinate activities across multiple manufacturing sites (pg. 1, par. [0003]).

45. As per claim 40, Spriggs does not expressly teach displaying the display view includes providing a search engine enabling searching for calibration schedule data based on a time or a date associated with a calibration procedure.

Kall teaches to a search engine enabling searching for calibration schedule data based on a time or a date associated with a calibration procedure (pg. 9, par. [0165]-[0166], Fig. 32 and Fig. 33, i.e. automatic sort).

Therefore, it would have been obvious to a person of ordinary skill in the art at the time of applicant's invention to modify the teaching of Spriggs to include a search engine enabling searching for calibration schedule data based on a time or a date associated with a calibration procedure to synchronize and coordinate activities across multiple manufacturing sites (pg. 1, par. [0003]).

46. As per claim 44, Spriggs teaches the remote site to enables a user at the remote site (col. 3, lines 43-48, col. 9, lines 58-66 and col. 10, lines 10-18, col. 40, lines 5-8

Art Unit: 2121

and Fig. 2, element D sub. N) to access to the entity data in the database (col. 8, lines 54-58) and to present the entity data according to the predetermined viewing format (col. 5, lines 41-59).

Spriggs does not expressly teach to a search engine view.

Kall teaches to a search engine view (pg. 9, par. [0165]-[0166], Fig. 32 and Fig. 33).

Therefore, it would have been obvious to a person of ordinary skill in the art at the time of applicant's invention to modify the teaching of Spriggs to include a search engine view to synchronize and coordinate activities across multiple manufacturing sites (pg. 1, par. [0003]).

47. Claims 19, 22 and 26 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Spriggs in view of U.S. Patent Publication No. 2004/0230897 (hereinafter Latzel).

48. As per claim 19, Spriggs does not expressly teach the web server includes a first application that acquires the entity data from the primary data collection platform as XML data and includes a second application that places the XML data into a web page using the predefined viewing format.

Latzel teaches to the web server includes a first application that acquires the entity data from the primary data collection platform as XML data and includes a second application that places the XML data into a web page using the predefined viewing format (pg. 3, par. [0043]).

Therefore, it would have been obvious to a person of ordinary skill in the art at the time of applicant's invention to modify the teaching of Spriggs to include a web server that includes a first application that acquires the entity data from the primary data collection platform as XML data and includes a second application that places the XML data into a web page using the predefined viewing format to conveniently edit and generate web sites, and provide simplified automated editing of web sites, requiring less technical expertise (pg. 1, par. [0006]).

49. As per claim 22, Spriggs teaches to a web server substantially the same as claimed but does not expressly teach the web server includes an application that acquires event data from the primary data collection platform in response to a request from one of the remote platforms, places the acquired event data into a web page using the predetermined viewing format and sends the web page to the one of the remote platforms.

Latzel teaches to the web server includes an application that acquires event data from the primary data collection platform in response to a request from one of the remote platforms, places the acquired event data into a web page using the predetermined viewing format and sends the web page to the one of the remote platforms (pg. 3, par. [0043]).

Therefore, it would have been obvious to a person of ordinary skill in the art at the time of applicant's invention to modify the teaching of Spriggs to include the web server includes an application that acquires event data from the primary data collection platform in response to a request from one of the remote platforms, places the acquired event data into a web page using the predetermined viewing format and sends the web page to the one of the remote platforms to conveniently edit and generate web sites, and provide simplified automated editing of web sites, requiring less technical expertise (pg. 1, par. [0006]).

50. As per claim 26, Spriggs does not expressly teach the second site is geographically separated from the primary data collection platform.

Latzel teaches to a second site is geographically separated from the primary data collection platform (pg. 4, par. [0051]).



Therefore, it would have been obvious to a person of ordinary skill in the art at the time of applicant's invention to modify the teaching of Spriggs to include a second site that is geographically separated from the primary data collection platform to conveniently edit and generate web sites, and provide simplified automated editing of web sites, requiring less technical expertise (pg. 1, par. [0006]).

### ***Response to Arguments***

51. Applicant's arguments, see pgs. 9-11, filed 25 June 2007 with respect to claims 1-4, 7-9, 15-18, 23-25, 27-30, 32-35 and 41-43 rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(e) have been considered but are moot in view of the new ground(s) of rejection for independent claims 1 and 24.

52. Applicant argues that the prior art fails to teach, the paraphrased limitation of "a display that presents entity data in a predetermined common format, where the entity data is collected or generated by data source applications that present the entity data in different formats". The examiner respectfully disagrees.

The Examiner emphasizes that all anticipated components and limitations of pending claims are present in the prior art as supported below. In addition, the Examiner notes the paraphrased limitation of "a display that presents entity data in a predetermined common format, where the entity data is collected or generated by data

source applications that present the entity data in different formats" was newly presented in the Amendment After Non-Final received on 25 June 2007 by the Office, and has been addressed as set forth in the Office Action above.

Spriggs discloses (col. 11, lines 12-21) "A portable data collector module, a TDXnet.RTM. data collector module (communications processor) manufactured by Bently Nevada Corporation located in Minden, Nev., and an OPC data collector module are specific examples of data collector modules 50 for specific data acquisition devices 60. These modules collect the data via each of the devices known supported protocol and convert it to a standard input that is received by the core data acquisition module 22 for further processing."

(col. 11, lines 47-53) "Referring now to FIG. 4, the data acquisition core module 22 provides a data-conditioning layer between the physical world and both the database module 80 and the display module 100. Uniquely, the data acquisition core 22 includes means for real time interfacing with both the database module 80 and the display module 100 for providing real time export and real time display of data."

(col. 15, lines 63-67) "A key to the design of the system 10 is its ability to normalize these inputs into a predefined standard so it is easy for the database 82 to

store data and for the display application to present data in a consistent manner regardless of its source."

53. In response to applicant's argument that the references fail to show certain features of applicant's invention, it is noted that the features upon which applicant relies (i.e., the data source application have their own presentation format) are not recited in the rejected claim(s). Although the claims are interpreted in light of the specification, limitations from the specification are not read into the claims. See *In re Van Geuns*, 988 F.2d 1181, 26 USPQ2d 1057 (Fed. Cir. 1993).

54. Applicant's arguments, see pgs. 9-11, filed 25 June 2007 with respect to claims 5, 6, 10-14, 19-22, 26, 31 and 36-40 rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) have been considered but are moot in view of the new ground(s) of rejection for independent claims 1 and 24.

55. Claims 5, 6, 10-14, 19-22, 26, 31 and 36-40 stand rejected as set forth above.

### ***Conclusion***

The prior art made of record and not relied upon is considered pertinent to applicant's disclosure.

The following references are cited to further show the state of the art with respect to information management and navigation.

U.S. Patent Publication No. 2007/0033521 discloses a method and system are provided for tagging, indexing, searching, retrieving, manipulating, and editing video images on a wide area network such as the Internet.

U.S. Patent Publication No. 2007/0150822 discloses a distributed user interface (UI) system includes a client device configured to render a UI for a server-based application.

U.S. Patent No. 7,171,468 discloses a method and system for accessing a network-based document server application from a client.

U.S. Patent No. 7,197,517 discloses an easy to use graphical user interface (GUI) for displaying, navigating, and selecting hierarchical database segments and fields.

U.S. Patent No. 7,207,005 discloses a translation management system in a computer environment.

Applicant's amendment necessitated the new ground(s) of rejection presented in this Office action. Accordingly, **THIS ACTION IS MADE FINAL**. See MPEP § 706.07(a). Applicant is reminded of the extension of time policy as set forth in 37 CFR 1.136(a).

A shortened statutory period for reply to this final action is set to expire THREE MONTHS from the mailing date of this action. In the event a first reply is filed within TWO MONTHS of the mailing date of this final action and the advisory action is not mailed until after the end of the THREE-MONTH shortened statutory period, then the shortened statutory period will expire on the date the advisory action is mailed, and any extension fee pursuant to 37 CFR 1.136(a) will be calculated from the mailing date of the advisory action. In no event, however, will the statutory period for reply expire later than SIX MONTHS from the date of this final action.

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Jennifer L. Norton whose telephone number is 571-272-3694. The examiner can normally be reached on 8:00 a.m. - 4:30 p.m..

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Anthony Knight can be reached on 571-272-3687. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 571-273-8300.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status

Art Unit: 2121

information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see <http://pair-direct.uspto.gov>. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free). If you would like assistance from a USPTO Customer Service Representative or access to the automated information system, call 800-786-9199 (IN USA OR CANADA) or 571-272-1000.

A handwritten signature in black ink, appearing to read 'Anthony Knight', is positioned above the printed name.

Anthony Knight  
Supervisory Patent Examiner  
Art Unit 2121